UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,775	10/18/2001	Jason J. Harms	2290	4210

			EXAMINER
21186	7590	02/09/2005	VO, TED T

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/682,775	HARMS, JASON J.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ted T. Vo	2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 October 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/01/02*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20050203

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the communication filed on 10/18/2001.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   Some contents listed in Form PTO 1449 submitted on 04/01/2002 would not be

considered because the publication date is not identified. See MPEP § 1.98 (b)(5).

Specification

3.   The content of this specification is objected to. The set of Claims in pages 14-18 fails to

comply with the requirement of 37 CFR 1.75(i): Each element or step of the claim should be

separated by a line indentation. It requires correcting in the next replying.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and
> distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

Claim 1: Claim 1 recites "device" and "unknown type" in a device. In the whole scope of claim, it

does not know what the limitations "device", "unknown" and "type" are. Particularly, the word

"unknown", has its meaning as "not known within the range of knowledge". This range is not specified or defined in the claim. Preceding functionality of these limitations is not known causing the limitation is unclear in the claim. These limitations have the claim failing to particularly point out what the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Thus Claims 1 is indefinite.

The interpretation of these limitations:

Device: a thing made for a particular purpose

Type: a category of things

Unknown: belong to things that are not known.

Claims 2-5: Claims 2-5 depends on Claim 1 that is identified as indefinite. Dependent claims of an indefinite claim are indefinite claims.

Claim 6: Claim 6 recites "USB" and "unknown". In the whole scope of claim, it does not know what the limitations "USB", and "unknown" are. "USB" appears to be a label and does not impart functionality in the claim. There is no indication between "unknown" and "know". Preceding functionality of these limitations is not known causing the limitation is unclear in the claim. These limitations have the claim failing to particularly point out what the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Thus Claims 6 is indefinite.

The interpretation of these limitations:

USB: a label shown in a registry.

Unknown: not known within the range of knowledge.

Claims 7-9: Claims 7-9 depends on Claim 6 that is identified as being indefinite. Dependent claims of an indefinite claim are indefinite claims.

Claim 10: The functionality or the incorporation of the claimed preamble "wherein the instructions when executed comprise:" and the body of the claim is unclear. It is noted that "instructions" when executed would cause an action. Instructions comprise only a sequence of code of a particularly programming language. Lack in incorporating between preamble and claimed body causes the whole claim to be unclear

The recitation "unknown" is indefinite because there is no indication between what it is "known"

and "unknown".

<u>Claims 11-12</u>: Claims 11-12 depends on Claim 10 that is identified as being indefinite.

Dependent claims of an indefinite claim are indefinite claims.

<u>Claim 13</u>: The functionality or the incorporation of the claimed recitation "*wherein the instructions*

when executed comprise:" and the body of the claim is unclear. The recitation "unknown" in the

claims is indefinite because there is no indication between "known" and "unknown".

See the rationale addressed in Claim 10 above.

<u>Claims 14-16</u>: Claims 14-16 depends on Claim 13 that is identified as being indefinite.

Dependent claims of an indefinite claim are indefinite claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or
> composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent
> therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7.   The claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

<u>As per claims 1-5</u>: Regarding Claim 1, it broadly recites a method. Claim 1 does not recite or is

presented with practical results. A <u>claimed</u> invention as a whole must produce a "useful, concrete

and tangible" result to have a practical application. In this case, this Claim is broad and featured

as searching a key in an entry of a device and remove it. Within this broad scope, it does not

provide a practical result, but acts likes manipulating an idea. Moreover, the method also fails to

be tangibly embodied. Using, paper, document, manually, a person can implement a method as

claimed.

Such claim fails to be in the technological or useful arts and thus fails to recite patent eligible

subject matters.

Claims 2-5 fail to remedy the deficiencies of independent claim 1.

- According to the analysis above, claims 1-5 are not tangible in computer hardware for causing the computer to execute in a practical manner. The claims 1-5 thus are manipulating an abstract idea and held nonstatutory.

As per claims 6-9: Regarding Claim 6, it broadly recites a method. The method of Claim 6 does recite practical results. The Claim is broad and featured as searching a registry for a USB printer and remove an entry. Broadly, registry includes a place where records are kept, and USB printer has means of a label, and from that, with papers, pens, documents, a person can manually implement a method as claimed. Thus, the claim fails to be tangibly embodied and to provide a practical result.

Such claim fails to be in the technological or useful arts and thus fails to recite patent eligible subject matters.

Claims 7-9 fail to remedy the deficiencies of independent claim 1.

- According to the analysis above, claims 6-9 are not tangible in computer hardware for causing the computer to execute in a practical manner. The claims 6-9 thus are manipulating an abstract idea and held nonstatutory.

8.   To expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of application amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in
public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in
the United States.

10.   Claim 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garms et al.,

"Windows NT™ Server 4", SAMS Publishing, Chapter 19, pages 567-597, 1998.

Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the

specification.

As per Claim 1: Garms discloses,

A method, comprising: searching configuration data for an entry for a device with an unknown

type (Page 590: See Finding Registry Information. Page 592: Figure 19.20 showing a Registry

Editor with *"searching configuration data for an entry for a device with an unknown"* such as all

the information within the "HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE"); *and*

removing the entry for the device with the unknown type from the configuration data (Figure 19.20

shows a highlight over Key information. Page 581, Figure 19.4 shows "Delete". Click on this

would perform *removing the entry for the device*).

As per Claim 2: Garms discloses, *The method of claim 1, further comprising:*

determining a vendor of the device with the unknown type (Page 587: Figure 19.11, give a user to

determine in the tree's registry "*a vendor of the device with the unknown type*" if the device

existed in registry);

searching subkeys in the configuration data for all devices associated with the vendor; and

deleting keys associated with the devices associated with the vendor (Page 587: Figure 19.11,

give a user to search subkeys through sub-trees in the registry if they are existed; using right click

of the mouse which is pointed on the subkeys, and using 'Delete' as shown in Figure 19.4).

As per Claim 3: Garms discloses, *The method of claim 1, further comprising: modifying an*

initialization file to remove device information (Note: registry is a set of initialization files. As

shown in page 570: see Note: Windows NT still supports the use of .INI file. Figure 19.2 in page

576 comprises Registry Hives; a user can access or edit config directory or a directory that has

.ini file, and thus the user could edit the .INI file to remove/modify whatever he wants.).

As per Claim 4: Garms discloses, *The method of claim 1, further comprising: deleting files*

identified in a file list (See page 587: all list, files, elements in the registry editor are removable).

As per Claim 5: Garms discloses, *The method of claim 4, wherein the deleting element further*

comprises: saving a backup copy of the files prior to deletion (See in page 594, table 19.4 shows

all the permissions done by a user including "Create Subkey", Create Link"; and see Figure 19.4,

in page 581, there are commands such as "New", "Rename", Copy Key Name", etc. Theses

features allow a user to save into a backup file before deleting).

As per Claim 6: Garms discloses, *A method, comprising: searching a registry for a USB*

(Universal Serial Bus) printer with an unknown description; and removing an entry for the printer

with the unknown description from the registry (See Figure 19.11, page 587: a Registry Editor has

"Print" in the left and includes unknown description in right; and see table 19.4, all permissions

including "Delete").

As per Claim 7: Garms discloses, *The method of claim 6, further comprising: determining a*

vendor of the printer; searching subkeys in the registry for all printers associated with the vendor;

and deleting keys for all the printers associated with the vendor.

(Page 587: Figure 19.11, give a user to determine in the tree's registry "*a vendor of the printer*";

Figure 19.11, give a user to search subkeys through sub-trees in the registry if they are existed;

using right click of the mouse which is pointed on the subkeys, and using 'Delete' as shown in

Figure 19.4).

As per Claim 8: Garms discloses, *The method of claim 6, further comprising: clearing load, run,*

and device lines from an initialization file (See page 570: with the Note: Windows NT still supports

the use of .INI file. Figure 19.2 in page 576 comprises Registry Hives; user can access or edit config directory or a directory that has .ini file, and thus the user could edit the .INI file to remove/modify whatever he wants.).

As per Claim 9: Garms discloses, *The method of claim 6, further comprising: removing a devices section and a printerports sections from an initialization file.* (Page 576 comprises Registry Hives; user can access or edit config directory or a directory that has .ini file, and thus the user could remove remove/modify whatever he wants.).

As per Claim 10: Garms discloses, *A signal-bearing medium comprising instructions, wherein the instructions when executed comprise: deleting entries in a configuration file for all devices with an unknown description; scanning subkeys in the configuration file for a device entry associated with a selected vendor; and removing keys from the configuration file, wherein the keys are associated with the device entry* (Garms shows a registry editor in a Microsoft's Window install in computer medium. Page 590: Finding Registry Information. Page 592: Figure 19.20. Page 581, Figure 19.4 shows "Delete", where a user uses the registry editor can perform *deleting entries in a configuration file, scanning subkeys in the configuration file*).

As per Claim 11: As addressed in section 4, "instructions comprising" is indefinite. Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the specification:

Garms discloses, *"The signal-bearing medium of claim 10, wherein the instructions further comprise: removing references associated with the device from an initialization file"* because Figure 19.4 shows "Delete".

As per Claim 12: Garms discloses, *The signal-bearing medium of claim 10, wherein the instructions further comprise: deleting files identified in a file list,* because Figure 19.4 shows "Delete"; Registry Editor shows a hierarchy of files. So, a user can perform *deleting files identified in a file list.*

As per Claim 13: Garms discloses, *A computer, comprising: a processor; and storage comprising instructions executable on the processor, wherein the instructions when executed comprise: detecting devices attached to the computer, identifying the attached devices as unknown when drivers for the attached devices are not present, installing device drivers, and deleting entries in a*

configuration file for all devices with an unknown description, because the showing Registry

Editor is a popup window executed by a processor. In Page 590: Finding Registry Information.

Page 592: Figure 19.20. Page 581, Figure 19.4 shows "Delete"; where with the Registry Editor a

user can perform *detecting devices, identifying the attached devices* shown in the registry,

installing device drivers, deleting entries in a configuration file.

As per Claim 14: Garms discloses, *The computer of claim 13, wherein the instructions further*

comprise: scanning subkeys in the configuration file for a device entry associated with a selected

vendor. Garms shows a registry editor that can provide subkey search like it is shown in Figure

19.16, page 589; thus a user can scan *subkeys in the configuration file for a device entry*

associated with a selected vendor. Page 590: Finding Registry Information. Page 592: Figure

19.20: Click the software subkey, etc.

As per Claim 15: Garms discloses, *The computer of claim 14, wherein the instructions further*

comprise: removing keys from the configuration file, wherein the keys are associated with the

device entry. Garms further shows a registry editor provided with entries, and a function "delete"

as shown in Figure 19.4, page 581 can perform removing keys from the configuration file,

wherein the keys are associated with the device entry.

As per Claim 16: Garms discloses, *The computer of claim 13, wherein the instructions further*

comprise: modifying an initialization file to remove information associated with the device. Figure

19.2 in page 576 comprises Registry Hives; a user can access or edit config directory or a

directory that has .ini file, and thus the user could edit the .INI file to remove/modify whatever he

wants.

As per Claim 17: Garms discloses, *An apparatus, comprising: means for removing a registry key*

associated with a predetermined device of a computer system (See Figure 19.4, page

581:"delete"); *and means for modifying a configuration file to indicate removal of the*

predetermined device from the computer system, wherein the predetermined device is removed

from the computer system so as to not interfere with a subsequent device installation (See Figure

19.2: a popup window of Config files; with user commands on the left top "file", "edit" would allow

a user means for modifying. Figure 19.17, page 590 shows a log).

As per Claim 18: Garms discloses, *An apparatus as claimed in claim 17, wherein said removing means includes means for removing registry keys according to a vendor of the predetermined device* (See Figure 19.4, page 581:"delete").

As per Claim 19: Garms discloses, *An apparatus as claimed in claim 17, said removing means removing at least one registry key selected from a list of registry keys consisting of:*

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\enum\device bus

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\System\CurrentControlSet\Control\device

function\Environments\Windows 4.0\Drivers

HKEY__LOCAL_MACHINE\System\currentcontrolset\control\device

function\monitors

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\System\CurrentControlSet\Control\device function\Ports

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\System\CurrentControlSet\Control\device function\device

type

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\Config\0001\System\CurrentControlSet\Control\device

function\device type

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\System \CurrentControlSet\Services\Class,

(Examiner note: With "delete" a user can perform removing all the Hkeys as shown) *where device bus indicates a type of bus the predetermined device uses to couple to the computer system* (Page 591 "TIP" shows subskey with the path coupled with

\ MACHINE\SYSTEM. Tables 19.3, page 577, indicates types of bus, predetermined devices), *device function indicates a function the predetermined devices provides, and device type indicates a group classification of the predetermined device.*

As per Claim 20: Garms discloses, *An apparatus as claimed in claim 17, said modifying means modifying the configuration file, wherein the configuration file is selected from a list consisting of: win.ini, windows.inf, windows\system, and windows\system32,* see Figure 19.2, a user can modify whatever editable.

As per Claim 21: Garms discloses, *An apparatus as claimed in claim 17, said removing means*

removing at least one registry key, wherein the at least one register key is selected from a list of

registry keys consisting of:

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\enum\device bus

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\System\CurrentControlSet\Control\device

function\Environments\Windows 4.0\Drivers

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\System\currentcontrolset\control\device

function\monitors

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\System\CurrentControlSet\Control\device function\Ports

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\System\CurrentControlSet\Control\device function\device type

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\Config\0001\System\CurrentControlSet\Control\device

function\device type

HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE\System\CurrentControlSet\Services\Class,

where the device bus indicates a type of bus the predetermined device uses to couple to the

computer system, the device function indicates a function the predetermined devices provides,

and the device type indicates a group classification of the predetermined device, and the

modifying means modifying at least one of the following configuration files: win.ini, windows.inf,

windows\system, and windows\system32. See Figure 19.2, and 19.4 a user can modify/delete

whatever editable.

As per Claim 22: Garms discloses the limitation of claim 22. See Figure 19.2, and 19.4 a user

can manually modify/delete whatever editable, and thus has means for the modifying means

modifying a win.ini file by clearing at least one or more of following lines in the win.ini file

associated with the predetermined device: load=, run=, device=lines, and at least one or more of

the following sections of the win.ini file: devices and device ports sections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.　　　The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.　　　Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Garms et al.,

"Windows NT™ Server 4", in view of Gazdik, US Pat No. 6,324,691.

　　　　　Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the

specification.

<u>As per Claim 23</u>: Garms discloses Registry Hive and Registry Editor used with the Windows NT

that can perform registering all Keys from users for software installation and uninstallation, and

thus Garms' Registry Editor includes means for *removing means being configured by one or*

more of the following: software stored on an information storage medium and loaded onto the

computer system, software downloaded onto the computer system via a network, and software

instructions executed by a remote machine coupled to the computer system via a network.

　　　　　Garms does not explicitly address the *software downloaded onto the computer system*

via a network, and software instructions executed by a remote machine coupled to the computer

system via a network. However, Garms' WINDOWS NT is available with Network connection

(See Figure 19.6, page 582) and thus suggests receiving/installing all downloaded software.

Gazdik discloses software is downloaded and installed or uninstalled in a computer from a remote sever and executed by the install/uninstall processing engine (Gazdik, column 4, lines 26-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include, "downloading software" for installation/uninstallation as disclosed by Gazdik to the teaching for deleting Hkeys using the Registry Editor of Garms. Doing so, would utilize the availability and convenience of Network provided for software installation.

As per Claim 24: Garms discloses Registry Hive and Registry Editor used with the Windows NT that can perform registering all Keys from users for software installation and uninstallation, and thus Garms' Registry Editor includes means for *modifying means being configured by one or more of the following: software stored on an information storage medium and loaded onto the computer system, software downloaded onto the computer system via a network, and software instructions executed by a remote machine coupled to the computer system via a network.*

Garms does not explicitly address the *software downloaded onto the computer system via a network, and software instructions executed by a remote machine coupled to the computer system via a network.* However, Garms' WINDOWS NT is available with Network connection (See Figure 19.6, page 582) and thus suggests receiving/installing all downloaded software.

Gazdik discloses software is downloaded and installed or uninstalled in a computer from a remote sever and executed by the install/uninstall processing engine (Gazdik, column 4, lines 26-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include, "downloading software" for installation/uninstallation as disclosed by Gazdik to the teaching for deleting Hkeys using the Registry Editor of Garms. Doing so, would utilize the availability and convenience of Network provided for software installation.

As per Claim 25: Garms discloses Registry Hive and Registry Editor used with the Windows NT that can perform registering all Keys from users for software installation and uninstallation, and

thus Garms' Registry Editor includes *removing means being configured by one or more of the following: software stored on an information storage medium and loaded onto the computer system, software downloaded onto the computer system via a network, and software instructions executed by a remote machine coupled to the computer system via a network.*

Garms does not explicitly address the *software downloaded onto the computer system via a network, and software instructions executed by a remote machine coupled to the computer system via a network.* However, Garms' WINDOWS NT is available with Network connection (See Figure 19.6, page 582) and thus suggests receiving/installing all downloaded software.

Gazdik discloses software is downloaded and installed or uninstalled in a computer from a remote sever and executed by the install/uninstall processing engine (Gazdik, column 4, lines 26-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include, "downloading software" for installation/uninstallation as disclosed by Gazdik to the teaching for deleting Hkeys using the Registry Editor of Garms. Doing so, would utilize the availability and convenience of Network provided for software installation.

As per Claim 26: Garms discloses Registry Hive and Registry Editor used with the Windows NT that can perform registering all Keys from users for software installation and uninstallation, and thus Garms' Registry Editor includes *modifying means being configured by one or more of the following: software stored on an information storage medium and loaded onto the computer system, software downloaded onto the computer system via a network, and software instructions executed by a remote machine coupled to the computer system via a network.*

Garms does not explicitly address the *software downloaded onto the computer system via a network, and software instructions executed by a remote machine coupled to the computer system via a network.* However, Garms' WINDOWS NT is available with Network connection (See Figure 19.6, page 582) and thus suggests receiving/installing all downloaded software.

Gazdik discloses software is downloaded and installed or uninstalled in a computer from a remote sever and executed by the install/uninstall processing engine (Gazdik, column 4, lines 26-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include, "downloading software" for installation/uninstallation as disclosed by Gazdik to the teaching for deleting Hkeys using the Registry Editor of Garms. Doing so, would utilize the availability and convenience of Network provided for software installation.

Conclusion

13.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gray et al. US Pat. No. 6,578,045 B1, discloses retrieving information maintained in a window registry.

Minasi, "Mastering™ Windows NT® Sever 4", discloses registry editor in Windows NT.

Hunt, "Creating User-Mode Device Drivers with a Proxy", discloses creating device drivers in Windows NT.

Brooks, "Microsoft Window 95 Registry with Delphi", disclose registry structure in Windows 95.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3706. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3694. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ted T. Vo
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2122
February 03, 2004